



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 10/721,152 | 11/25/2003 | Michael D. Grah | P50-0053 | 5544 |
| 7590 | 12/22/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| Michelin North America, Inc. Intellectual Property Department P.O. Box 2026 Greenville, SC 29602-2026 | | | | FISCHER, JUSTIN R |
| | | ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 1733 | | |

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

| | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Application No. | 10/721,152 | Applicant(s) |
| Examiner | Art Unit Justin R. Fischer | 1733 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-9, 11 and 16-21.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 11: Applicant primarily argues that none of the secondary references teach or suggest the benefit of decreased hysteresis as found in applicant's claimed invention. Applicant further states that there is no motivation to combine the secondary references with the cited primary reference.

First, it is not required for the secondary references to expressly recognize the benefit of the claimed invention. In this instance, the secondary references expressly teach a composition having improved tensile strength and modulus due to the inclusion of the claimed metal salt and peroxide curative - these properties are desired in runflat tire supports and as such, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to include these additives in the tire support of Abinal. It is further noted that applicant acknowledges that the above noted additives are well known and furthermore, that it is well known that they provide improved mechanical properties (Page 6, 2nd Paragraph, Page 7, Last paragraph, and Page 8, 2nd Paragraph). Thus, it is clearly evident that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have had ample motivation to form the composition of Abinal with a metal salt and a peroxide curative- the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Lastly, applicant mentions Freeman (which is not part of the pending rejection) and argues that the reference specifically teaches that a peroxide may not be used to cure the disclosed system or otherwise a mass will be rendered

that is unsuitable for the manufacture of the desired rubber component. The key to this statement is "the disclosed system". Freeman discloses the following:

As will be appreciated by those skilled in the art, because the compounds are cured by sulfur, they do not contain any peroxide curative or other peroxide components.

This disclosure teaches that a rubber composition having sulfur in combination with peroxide curatives or other peroxide components would result in the above noted difficulties. It does not teach, as suggested by applicant, that a peroxide may not be used to cure a rubber compound that is suitable for use in a runflat system.



Justin Fischer

December 21, 2005